

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	Э.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,230		08/30/2001	John Whitman	4294.1US (98-1208.1)	2488
24247	7590	03/24/2004		EXAM	INER
TRASK BRITT				DICKEY, THOMAS L	
P.O. BOX	2550			·	
SALT LA	KE CITY.	ΓY, UT 84110		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•	•		2826	
				DATE MAIL ED: 03/24/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		tan
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/944,230	WHITMAN ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas L Dickey	2826
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 01 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this : (1) a timely filed amendmer peal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to a nt which places the application in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the ma	ailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). See have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the mely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	oire later than SIX MONTHS from the NAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH. The date on which the petition under the corresponder of the shortened statutory period for the later than three months after	e mailing date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP er 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ling amount of the fee. The appropriate extension for reply originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 0)		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:	
(a) _ they raise new issues that would require fu	rther consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Not		,
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	•	y materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cand NOTE:	celing a corresponding numb	per of finally rejected claims.
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej 	jection(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) work canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	uld be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:		n considered but does NOT place the
5. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed SO	LELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendm explanation of how the new or amended claims		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>14</u> .		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,4,11-13 and 15-20</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 2 and 5	<u>-10</u> .	
B. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ a	-	ed by the Examiner.
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stater		lod 11/03/03
0. Other:	nongaj(i 10-144a) rapel li	dbulken to
o Ouler		Minhloan Tran

Minnioan I ran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2826



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Yates et al. 6,358,793 and Kikuchi 6,278,153 both show layers of photoresist with flat surfaces. That is to say both Kikuchi and Yates et al. tell us they are drawing a cross-section of a three dimensional device and then draw the tops of layers of photoresist as straight lines.

The question is whether one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the flat surfaces of Yates et al. and Kikuchi as being "substantially planar."

The examiner's position is that one having ordinary skill in the art would understand "substantially planar" to be a general purpose term for a surface that is fairly flat along at least a part of its extent.

The applicant argues to the contrary that one having ordinary skill in the art would realize that layer of photoresist prepared as Kikuchi and Yates et al. prepare them would have "a variety of miniscule non-planar features." This may be so. If so, and if Applicant can eliminate said features, Applicant can overcome Kikuchi and Yates et al. by amending his claims by substituting the words "without any miniscule non-planar features," for the words "substantially planar." But the mere fact that it might be possible to make a surface flatter than Kikuchi and Yates et al. make theirs does not make their surfaces bumpy.

This examiner will not pass this application to allowance on the assumption that "substantially planar" actually means "without any miniscule non-planar features.".